



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/535,573	03/27/2000	Robert A. Foster	M-4540-1C us	3655

7590 06/18/2004

MACPHERSON KWOK CHEN & HEID LLP
1726 TECHNOLOGY DRIVE
SUITE 226
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, CUONG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3625	

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	09/535,573	Applicant(s)	FOSTER, ROBERT A.
Examiner	CUONG H. NGUYEN	Art Unit	3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 March 2004.
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 47-86 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 47-86 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is the answer to the Supp. Appeal Brief received on 3/05/2004.
2. Claims 47-86 are pending in this application.

Response to Amendment

3. The applicant repeatedly requests to reconsider the final rejection and upon the advice of appeal conferees (5/25/2004), THAT REQUEST IS GRANTED; previous Final Office action was not clear in rejections on 35 USC 103(a) when matching cited references in accordance to each claim, and the use of Duran (US Pat. 5,695,598) is improper for a Final Office Action. A non-final Office Action is hereby presented. The outstanding arguments are moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requires of this title.

5. Since USPTO are examining applications for utility patents, the claims must be directed to systems, methods or articles of manufacture that have a clear utility. See MPEP 706.03(a) for example. Over the years, numerous court decisions have analyzed the content of various claim language for meaningful, useful differences in structure or acts performed between the claims and the prior art.

6. Claims 47-67 and 68-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter (not being eligible for patent protection).

A. Re. to claims 47-67: They contain computer-per-se materials according to the preamble (i.e., "In a computer-readable medium,"). The claim subject matter MUST be useful, in contrast, claim 47 is ONLY useful when a computer is not running a claimed method (in claim 47) can not be derived (i.e., merely claiming a floppy disk with claimed instructions) – In State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group, Inc., 47 USPQ2D 1596, 1601-02 (Fed. Cir. 1998), the Court determined that when an abstract idea is reduced to a practical application, the abstract idea no longer stands alone if it produces a "useful, concrete and tangible result" – because claim 47 may not be concrete and tangible when a computer is not running, it is non-statutory.

B. Re. to claims 68-86: This claim contains computer-per-se materials, although a processing system is claimed. The claimed "means for creating ... instance..." contains "virtual" structural components wherein those components are computer instructions, i.e., a computer-per-se; and therefore are found to be non-statutory subject matter.

The invention MUST be a concrete idea; however, recited in those pending claims' limitations are not concrete material when a computer is not executing instructions in that computer-readable medium (i.e., there is NO physical structural relationships of said system's computer's components, there is NO link, no creation of different OO instances).

These claims contain abstract ideas; (i.e., containing computer-per-se materials, although a system for pricing transactions is claimed). The claimed "virtual" system has all "virtual" structural components wherein those components are computer instructions, i.e., a means for creating a transaction instance, means for creating a first

production service instance, means for creating a billing service instance .etc.; therefore, it is an abstract idea to one of ordinary skill in the art to recreate the claimed system for pricing transactions.

The invention as recited in these claims is merely an abstract idea that is not within the technological arts. Mere abstract ideas that do not apply, involve, use the technological arts fail to promote the "progress of science and the useful arts" (i.e., the physical sciences as opposed to social sciences, for example) and therefore are found to be non-statutory subject matter [see Bowman (BPAI), 61 USPQ2d 1669, 6/12/2001].

Even mere recitation in the preamble or mere suggestion in the claim that a machine is performing some or all of the steps in the method is NOT ENOUGH to place the claimed invention in the technological arts. The body of the claim must unambiguously recite that a machine/apparatus is performing the step(s) and/or is integrally involved in the process (i.e., a computer-implemented method) for the achieved effect (i.e., level of involvement, use, or advancement).

The phrase "technological arts" is synonymous with the phrase "useful arts" as it appears in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, *In re Waldbaum*, 173 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1972). For a claim to be statutory, it must be in the technological arts. *In re Musgrave*, 167 USPQ 280 (CCPA 1970) and *In re Johnston*, 183 USPQ 172 (CCPA 1974).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103(a), which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the

subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. (US Pat. 5,630,127), in view of Burt et al. (US Pat. 5,682,482).

It is directed to steps by executing a computer-readable medium that carry computer codes; only 3 main steps are listed in claim 47:

- creating a [transaction] instance;
- creating a [production service] instance;
- creating a [billing service] instance.

Here each instance having data identifying particular items such as transaction, production service, billing service. These data qualifies as nonfunctional descriptive material.

These claimed descriptive material are not functionally related to the substrate (a computer-readable medium). Rather those are just being held in the medium. As a result, those data can be called non-functional descriptive material and does not limit the claim.

Moore et al. teach that a rule-based application structure could be a relational database where records of a transaction are related/linked to each other (see Moore, the abstract, and Figs.3,4). Moore et al. teach that: service instances linking to transaction instances; and creating a billing service instance linked to a service instance with relation instance (see Moore, "FIG. 4 is an object instance table." 6:54-59 "An example of this table is shown in FIG. 3. The names or "objects" are shown in the columns "OBJECT" 302, "OBJECT1" 304 and "OBJECT2" 308. These names or "objects" stand for a multitude of particular instances of the data, any of which can be retrieved by specifying the identifiers of the entities listed above which would focus the access on a particular representation value."); 10:5-19, 10:45-55 "An additional feature of the GRMS architecture is the placement of the GRMS processor on the Business Professional's workstation 118 along with the Object Table 300, and the programs

defined in the object table 300. Since the object instance table 400 is also present, the Business Professional can change values in the Object Instance table (via GRMS screens and functions) and reprocess the report on the workstation. All object accesses will be satisfied by the Object Instance table function and therefore, the CMIM database 224 is not needed for this "What if" analysis reporting."; in OOP, "instance" is a variable name e.g., service instance, relation instance .etc.).

Although Moore et al. teach about a financial institution, and a single transaction can generate many object instances (see Moore et al., 1:21-30, and Detailed Description Text portion (para. 439) "Unique identifier for a GRMS transaction. A single GRMS transaction can generate many object instances"), Moore et al. do not explicitly disclose that financial transaction functions are connected together.

However, Burt et al. further disclose a system with related functions including financial transaction functions connecting together (e.g. see Burt et al., Fig. 5, the abstract, 4:25-27, and 25:2-16), comprising:

- creating a transaction instance corresponding to a financial transaction (e.g. see Burt et al., Fig.5, the abstract, col.6 lines 1-14, and col.21 lines 42-59).

The examiner submits that because Moore et al. teach applications using OOP macros wherein "instance" is a variable instance - an instance is a single occurrence of a class -, it would be obvious for the analogous use of macros: "transaction instance", "service instance", and "billing service instance".

Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from Moore et al., and Burt et al. in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381,

1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create different instances in the article of manufacture as shown in Moore and Burt et al. because such data does not functionally relate to the substrate of the article of manufacture and merely labeling the data differently from that in the prior art would have been obvious. See *Gulack* cited above.

8. Claim 68 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. (US Pat. 5,630,127), in view of Burt et al. (US Pat. 5,682,482).

Independent claim 68 recites a data processing system that comprises a means for creating a transaction event, a means for creating a production/service event, and the linking between events; this claim has similar limitations as of claim 47. Thus it is also rejected for the same rationales and references as claim 47.

9. Claims 75-77, 56-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. (US Pat. 5,630,127), in view of Burt et al. (US Pat. 5,682,482).

A. Re. to claim 75: The rationales and references for rejecting claim 68 are incorporated.

Moore et al. teach that an OOP software is used for creating different instances (i.e., a fourth relation instance) that links different instances (e.g., a transaction instance to an entity instance), (see Moore et al. Fig.4, and col.10 lines 25-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine specific applications to combine Moore et al., Burt et al., in financial transaction with OO programming (for different applications using relational database) because they all suggest a systematic method that use "instance" in a structural database to track all of the components of costs and fees each time a financial transaction is processed. It has been recognized that a finance system would be able to measure profitability in a flexible manner and to measure the impact of any changes from banking clients by tracking those variables.

B. Ref. to claims 76, 77, 56, 57:

The rationales and references for rejecting claim 68 are incorporated.

Burt et al. further teach about storing/retrieving relation instances in relation instance table (e.g., see Burt et al., claim 5 - this claim indicates that different rules for objects/instances are stored in tables, and can be retrieved from those tables in OOP); and creating a second entity instance related to first entity instance (e.g. see Burt et al., Fig. 4 – this figure indicates that different instances have relationships in OOP).

10. Re. to claims 79, 59, 83, 63, 65, 84: They are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. (US Pat. 5,630,127), in view of Burt et al. (US Pat. 5,682,482).

The rationales for rejection of claims 68 are incorporated herein.

Moore et al. and Burt et al. also teach :

- an OOP for creating an entity instance relating to another instance (e.g., a transaction instance);
- an OOP for creating an entity instance relating to above entity instance;

Moore et al. also teach a means for creating a price table instance related to an entity instance (see Moore et al., Fig.4); the examiner submits that in OOP variable instances can be created, and can be defined to relate to each other. (The claimed

phrase of "wherein a price table instance contains a price for a billing service instance" is a specific but fundamental application of instance variables in OOP).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine specific applications of Moore et al., and Burt et al., in OOP financial transaction (using relational database) because they all suggest a systematic method that use "instance" in an OOP to track components of costs and fees each time a financial transaction is processed. Artisan would recognize that a finance system would be a flexible application to measure the impact of any changes from financial transactions by tracking those instance variables.

11. Re. to claims 60, & 80: They are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. (US Pat. 5,630,127), in view of Burt et al. (US Pat. 5,682,482).

The examiner's position is that in an OOP software, it is obvious to define that "price table instance is a cost table instance, and a price is a cost" since it is merely defined as a variable instance in Moore et al.'s transaction.

The rationales and references for rejecting claim 79 are incorporated.

The examiner submits that a price table instance could be defined as a cost table instance, and said price could be a cost; or a price table instance could be defined as a fee table instance since price/fee table instance is just a sample instance data structure.

12. Re. to Claims 81, 61: They are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. (US Pat. 5,630,127), in view of Burt et al. (US Pat. 5,682,482).

The rationales and references for rejecting claim 79 are incorporated.

- The examiner submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that a price is understood as a fee, whether it is expressed in different term.

13. Re. to Claims 82, 62: They are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. (US Pat. 5,630,127), in view of Burt et al. (US Pat. 5,682,482).

The rationales and references for rejecting claim 81 are incorporated.

Moore et al., and Burt et al. use OOP for their applications. Their programs teach relations/linking between variable instances. Because their instances are variable, it is obvious to name them meaningfully to each specific application.

The uses of a relational database in cited prior art teach a step of creating a cost table instance related to a fee table instance by a relation instance.

Although Moore et al., and Burt et al. do not specifically disclose that "a cost table instance related to a fee table instance by a relation instance", the examiner submits that any OOP application having a characteristic of linking/relating between object instances. (e.g., see the admission from contents of claims 66, 85 wherein "entity instance" is a variable).

14. Re. To Claims 64, 66, 85: They are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. (US Pat. 5,630,127), in view of Burt et al. (US Pat. 5,682,482).

The rationales and references for rejecting claim 84 are incorporated.

The examiner submits that because an instance is defined as a variable in OOP, an entity instance can be defined as an account instance, a client instance, or can be defined as a market segment instance (see Burt, the abstract, claims 1-2).

By contents of the pending claims 66, 85, the applicant admits that an entity instance is a variable instance, since an entity instant can be used as an account instant or as a client instant.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine specific applications of Moore et al., and Burt et al., in OOP financial transaction because they all suggest a systematic method that use "instance" in an OOP to track components of costs and fees each time a financial transaction is processed. Artisan would recognize that an instant in OOP would be a variable to measure the impact of any changes from financial transactions by tracking those instance variables.

15. Re. To claims 50-53, 58, 69, 71-75, 83: They are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. (US Pat. 5,630,127), in view of Burt et al. (US Pat. 5,682,482).

The rationales and references for rejecting claim 68 are incorporated. Moore et al. obviously suggest a step of storing a transaction instance/an account instance/a client instance, a production service instance, a settlement service instance, and a billing service instance in an entity instance table, and they are inherently "link"/"relate" together as a functional data structure (e.g. see Moore et al. Fig.4, and col.10 lines 25-55).

Re. To claim 48: This claim is directed to a method of pricing transactions containing similar limitations as in "system" claim 69. Therefore, similar rationales and references set forth are also used for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

Re. To claims 69, 71-74: These claims are directed to a system of creating a “billing service instance” that link to a transaction instance by a relation instance. The examiner submits that this is an available function of an OOP used by Moore et al. Therefore, similar rationales and references set forth are also used for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

Re. To claim 50: This claim is directed to a method of pricing transactions containing similar limitations as in “system” claim 71. Therefore, similar rationales and references set forth are also used for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine specific applications of Moore et al., and Burt et al., in OOP financial transaction because they all suggest a systematic method that use “instance” in an OOP to track components of costs and fees each time a financial transaction is processed. Artisan would recognize that an instant in OOP would be a variable to measure the impact of any changes from financial transactions by tracking those instance variables.

16. Re. To claim 78: They are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. (US Pat. 5,630,127), in view of Burt et al. (US Pat. 5,682,482).

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 68 are incorporated.

- means for creating a settlement service instance linked to said billing service instance by a third relation instance.
Moore et al. teach that an OOP software is used for created different instances (i.e., a settlement service instance) that link/relate (using a relation instance) with

another instance (i.e., a billing service instance), (see Moore et al. Fig.4, and col.10 lines 25-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine specific applications to combine Moore et al., Burt et al., in financial transaction with OO programming (for different applications using relational database) because they all suggest a systematic method that use "instance" in a structural database to track all of the components of costs and fees each time a financial transaction is processed. It has been recognized that a finance system would be able to measure profitability in a flexible manner and to measure the impact of any changes from banking clients by tracking those variables.

17. Re. To claim 70: They are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. (US Pat. 5,630,127), in view of Burt et al. (US Pat. 5,682,482).

This claim further defines that "means for creating a second billing instance linked to said first production service instance by said 2nd service instance".

Moore et al. teach that an OOP software is used for created different instances that link with another instance (e.g. see Moore et al. Fig.4, and col.10 lines 25-55).

18. Re. To claim 49: It is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. (US Pat. 5,630,127), in view of Burt et al. (US Pat. 5,682,482).

This claim is directed to a method of pricing transactions containing similar limitations as in "system" claim 70. Therefore, similar rationales and references set forth are also used for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

G. Re. To claim 51: This claim is directed to a method of pricing transactions containing similar limitations as in “system” claim 72. Therefore, similar rationales and references set forth are also used for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

H. Re. To claim 52: This claim is directed to a method of pricing transactions containing similar limitations as in “system” claim 73. Therefore, similar rationales and references set forth are also used for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

I. Re. To claim 53: This claim is directed to a method of pricing transactions containing similar limitations as in “system” claim 74. Therefore, similar rationales and references set forth are also used for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

J. Re. To claim 54: This claim is directed to a method of pricing transactions containing similar limitations as in “system” claim 75. Therefore, similar rationales and references set forth are also used for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

19. Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. (US Pat. 5,630,127), in view of Burt et al. (US Pat. 5,682,482), further in view of Rothstein (US Pat. 5,636,117).

The rationales and references for rejecting claim 54 are incorporated.

Rothstein further teaches that a market segment instance could be an entity instance (see 2:8-10, 2:54-47, 3:9-12) (e.g., mortgage entities are linked to business models by indices in a program).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine specific applications of Moore et al., and Burt et al., in OOP financial transaction with Rothstein because they all suggest a systematic method that use “instance” in an OOP to track components of costs and fees each time a

financial transaction is processed. Artisan would recognize that an instant in OOP would be a variable to measure the impact of any changes from financial transactions by tracking those instance variables.

20. Claims 64, 66, 85, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore et al. (US Pat. 5,630,127), in view of Burt et al. (US Pat. 5,682,482), further in view of Claus et al. (US Pat. 5,559,313),

The rationales and references for rejecting claim 84 are incorporated.

Claus et al., further express analogous instances in a database, the examiner submits that since they are considered as variable instances in OOPs (see Figs.6, 9-11, 13, 15) for analogous examples that were claimed about:

- an entity instance could be an account instance;
- an entity instance could be a client instance;
- an entity instance could be a market segment instance.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine specific applications to combine Moore et al., Burt et al., and Claus et al. in financial transaction with OO programming (for different applications using relational database) because they all suggest a systematic method that use "instance" in a structural database to track all of the components of costs and fees each time a financial transaction is processed. It has been recognized that a finance system would be able to measure profitability in a flexible manner and to measure the impact of any changes from banking clients by tracking those variables.

21. Re. To claim 56: This claim is directed to a method of pricing transactions containing similar limitations as in "system" claim 76. Therefore, similar rationales and references set forth are also used for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

22. Re. To claim 57: This claim is directed to a method of pricing transactions containing similar limitations as in "system" claim 77. Therefore, similar rationales and references set forth are also used for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

23. Re. To claim 58: This claim is directed to a method of pricing transactions containing similar limitations as in "system" claim 78. Therefore, similar rationales and references set forth are also used for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

24. Re. To claim 59: This claim is directed to a method of pricing transactions containing similar limitations as in "system" claim 79. Therefore, similar rationales and references set forth are also used for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

25. Re. To claim 60: This claim is directed to a method of pricing transactions containing similar limitations as in "system" claim 80. Therefore, similar rationales and references set forth are also used for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

26. Re. To claim 61: This claim is directed to a method of pricing transactions containing similar limitations as in "system" claim 81. Therefore, similar rationales and references set forth are also used for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

27. To claim 62: This claim is directed to a method of pricing transactions containing similar limitations as in "system" claim 82. Therefore, similar rationales and references set forth are also used for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

28. Re. to claim 63: This claim is directed to a method of pricing transactions containing similar limitations as in "system" claim 83. Therefore, similar rationales and references set forth are also used for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

29. Re. To claim 65: This claim is directed to a method of pricing transactions containing similar limitations as in "system" claim 84. Therefore, similar rationales and references set forth are also used for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

30. Re. To claim 66: This claim is directed to a method of pricing transactions containing similar limitations as in "system" claim 85. Therefore, similar rationales and references set forth are also used for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

31. Re. To claim 86: The rationales and references for rejecting claim 84 are incorporated.

Means for creating a second price table instance related to first entity instance.

Moore et al. teach that an OOP software is used for created different instances (i.e., a second price instance) that link with another instance (i.e., a first entity instance), (see Moore et al. Fig.4, and col.10 lines 25-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine specific applications to combine Moore et al., Burt et al., in financial transaction with OO programming (for different applications using relational database) because they all suggest a systematic method that use "instance" in a structural database to track all of the components of costs and fees each time a financial transaction is processed. It has been recognized that a finance system would be able to measure profitability in a flexible manner and to measure the impact of any changes from banking clients by tracking those variables.

32. Re. To claim 67: This claim is directed to a method of pricing transactions containing similar limitations as in "system" claim 86. Therefore, similar rationales and references set forth are also used for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

Conclusion

33. Claims **47-86** are rejected.

34. Notes: The examiner submits that the reasons for rejection are obvious vs. cited prior arts. Applicant is suggested to indicate **in the claims** how the claims distinguish from the combining of cited prior arts. An instance, as defined, is a familiar component in object-oriented programming in relation to the class to which it belongs; a definition for "instance variable": a variable associated with an instance of a class (an object), if a class defines a certain variable, each instance of the class has its own copy of that variable. Hence, there is nothing inventive in defining/creating different instances that linking together in a data structure (the definition is already established for an obvious use of "instance" in cited prior art, i.e. an instance is a single example or occurrence of a class).

Moore et al., Burt et al., and Rothstein et al. teach applications using object-oriented program (OOP) wherein "instance" are variable instances of a program (please note that "**instance**" is a macro instruction (in OO programming language, it is a "**reserved term**" that defines a set of instructions that are substituted for the macro name wherever the name appears in a program. Macros are similar to functions in that they can take argument - an instance is a single example or occurrence of a class; e.g., programming instructions to show **Class** vs. **Instance** (from

<http://scv.bu.edu/Doc/Java/tutorial/java/anatomy/static.html> "The Anatomy of a Java Application)

Import java.util.Date;

```
Class DateApp {  
    Public static void main(String args[1]) {  
        Date today = new Date();  
        System.out.println(today);  
    }  
}
```

}

In above example, a Class is a Date, and an instance is Monday.

Burt et al. teach a method with related functions including financial transaction functions utilizing instance, although not expressly disclosed claimed phrase of: "creating related records to allow pricing transaction" (see **Burt** et al., Fig.5 – please note that "to allow pricing transaction" is a phrase for intend of use, that phrase is merely an exemplary situation among many different applications of "instance" in OOP); therefore, **Burt** et al. teach analogous functions as claimed (i.e. defining names for a specific application which does not change a required function in programs). **Moore** et al. further clarify such application with rule-based application structure could be a relational database where records of a transaction are related to each other (see **Moore**, the abstract, Figs.3,4, 10:5-34, 23:27-61, these para. indicate relationships of an object and access type with the value in the object instance entity). The examiner submits that "production service instance" and "billing service instance" in claims merely are examples of financial services OOP software using instance as a macro (e.g., banks charge a service fee for an extra monthly statement from ATMs, banks charge a service fee for transferring cash to a foreign bank due to a request of an account holder; these are financial services that have "linking" with each other by the use of a relational database management system disclosed by **Moore** et al., (please note that "instance" terms in claims are defined as standard situations in an object-oriented program. In Object-Oriented Program (OOP), an **object** is something that has an identity, a state, and a behaviour. the behaviour is encoded in methods (member functions). Objects are bundles of **related variables** and methods and are often used

to model real-world objects. It could be said that a class is a blueprint, and an object is a house. An object belonging to a class is referred to as an instance of the class. If humanity were a class, then [you] would be an instance of the class [human]. (Instance variable: In object-oriented programming, an **instance variable** or **data member** is data which an object keeps track of. The examiner submits that in cited references there is a relationship amongst variables; those relationships are called "linkings". Therefore, claimed limitations are obvious with interpretations.(in other words, instances are variables in an object-oriented program, and they are linked directly or indirectly; this is a function/ability of an object-oriented program).

35. The term of "being linked" is taught by **Burt** et al. as using "connection layer" and "connection instance" (see **Burt** et al., Fig.5). The examiner submits that **Burt** et al. teach a relational model as claimed (see **Burt** et al., Fig.5); "relational model is a data model in which the data is organized in relations (tables). This is the model implemented in most modern database management system"; therefore, banking transactions and related pricing were known to implement this model for the pending claimed relational structures (such use of a relational database management software have been applied for banking transactions, see **Moore** et al., the abstract, Figs.3,4, 10:5-34, 23:27-61 e.g., these para. indicate relationships of an object and access type with the value in the object instance entity).

36. The examiner also submits that suggestions for "Categorization of purchased items for each transaction by a smart card" had been discussed by **Claus** et al. in their patent (see **Claus**, claim 1, and 2:15 to 3:22), and a relational database of items/instances for different transactions were done in a financial software program.

37. The Microsoft Computer Dictionary (published in 1996) defines a standardized meaning of a database wherein data components are linked together within that database as followings: linked list: In programming, a list of elements of a data

structure connected by pointers. A singly linked list has one pointer in doubly linked list has two pointers in each node pointing to the next and previous nodes. In a circular list, the first and last nodes of the list are linked together; and link: To produce an executable program from compiled modules (programs, routines, or libraries) by merging the object code (assembly language object code, executable machine code) of the program and resolving interconnecting references (such as a library routine called by a program), or to connect two elements in a data structure by using index variables (index: A listing of keywords and associated data that point to the location of more comprehensive information, such as files and records on a disk/record keys in a database), or pointer variables (pointer: In programming and information processing, a variable that contains the memory location (address) of some data rather than data itself). The act of linking data/items from different parts in a database is in cited references of **Moore et al.**, **Burt et al.**, **Rothstein**, **Clause et al.**, and they are a fundamental knowledge in database structure of OOPs; from that available computer programming knowledge the applicant uses it to apply for a specific use (i.e. for pricing transactions). Therefore, the invention does not teach any new inventive concept according to cited references.

38. The examiner submits that claims 47, and 68 comprise elements of a relational database structure, would utilize an instance variable in its object-oriented program (i.e., an **instance** is an *instantiated object* of a particular class), an **object** is something that can have properties and relations).

39. At the end, on pg.5, 1st para., the applicant argues that cited references do not teach a "client instance" and a "market segment instance".

The examiner submits that one with ordinary skill in the art would understand that in an object-oriented program (e.g., Java, Visual Basic, C++ .etc.):

- an (entity) instance could be a client instance; an entity instance could be a market segment instance because in OOP, "instance" is a variable: an **instance** is an *instantiated* object of a particular class.

The examiner submits that cited prior art's limitations are not necessary spelled-out exactly claimed languages; analogous interpretations based on definition for functions of those terms show that such claimed languages would be obvious for meaningful modifications in OOP using in cited art's situations.

40. All claimed limitations have been known since events for pricing transactions always "link" to related objects in a relational database. As the examiner presents that the claimed subject matter is obvious with one of skills in the art, different "instances" in above claims may be defined according to the use of a particular "instance" in an object-oriented program, in relation to the "class" to which it belongs; in other words, instance variable is just a variable associated with an event/action/instance of a class in OOPs (a **class** is a template for a group of objects an object such as: client, market segment with similar behaviour, and a common inheritance).

41. These references are also considered having similar subject matters to this application:

- Durand et al., (US Pat. 5,694,598) teach that an account instance is represented as a data list similarly as an entity instance; a market segment instant could be an entity instance (e.g. see '117 col.2 lines 8-10, and lines 54-57, col.3 lines 9-12); for a use of instance in OOP in a relational database, wherein different programming instances can be linked together); their patent discloses: "The relational database model was introduced in the early 1970's by E. F. Codd. Since then, the relational model has become the model employed by most commercial database management systems (DBMS). Data in a relational database is represented as a collection of relations. Each relation can be thought of as a table. Like the relational database model, **object-oriented** programming ("OOP") has also existed since the early 1970's. In the early 1990's, **object-oriented** programming gained widespread acceptance due to increased power of workstations, proliferation of graphical user-interfaces and the development of hybrid **object-oriented** languages such as C++. The OOP paradigm provides a class construct which combines data and procedural abstractions. The definition of a class includes a definition of the storage requirements of the class as well as the procedures which define how objects of the class behave. An object is an **instance** of a class. Every object includes the data and procedural characteristics of its class. In addition, new objects inherit the storage and functionality defined by all classes used to define the parent of the object. The present proliferation of relational DBMSs coupled with the increasing popularity of the OOP paradigm has resulted in a desire to map data between data models. In particular, it is desirable to access relational databases in OOP applications, and to access **object-oriented** data from within a relational DBMS.

Commercial tools currently available for mapping **object-oriented** data to

relational DBMSs include Persistence, ROCK Phase II, and ObjectStore. These tools are primarily intended to allow application objects to be persistent. Further, these applications typically assume a straight mapping correspondence between application objects and a database schema. Various approaches have been considered for object-relational integration. In most approaches, the purpose has been to interface **object-oriented** applications with relational data storage.

These approaches include:

The embedded database interaction in which the interaction is controlled directly by the methods of the object class (e.g. using embedded SQL). This approach makes the **object-oriented** application rather tightly coupled to the data-storage technology. It is well suited to code generation techniques when the mapping is straightforward. Persistence is one commercial product incorporating this approach. The import-export approach uses an external module which is invoked as a conversion facility for objects. This approach has been used for conversions between relational and object databases. It can be used for providing persistence and object views to **object-oriented** applications. The import-export module acts as an external object server. Although the functional coupling is loose, the module requires information regarding the models on each end and must maintain the consistency of its representations."

- Motivations: "Flexibility: The solution should provide independence from the storage technology;

Composability: The mapping operations and operators should be easy to combine, since requests may concern aggregations of objects such as collections and compositions hierarchies;

Security: The solution should prevent the application designer from accessing the database in an unauthorized or inefficient way;

Evolution: The mapping technique should be flexible with regard to changes in the domain **object-oriented** model, in the database schema and in the physical organization; and

"Design overhead": The mapping solution should limit the complexity added to the application object model.".

- **Bohrer** et al., (US Pat. 5,943,497 - August 24, 1999 - 717/121,108), Object-oriented apparatus and method for controlling configuration of object creation, wherein an object-oriented mechanism is disclosed that allows new configuration data to replace existing configuration data within an existing object-oriented program. The new configuration data allows an OO program to be quickly and easily generated from an existing OO program without manually changing the source code of the existing OO program. When a factory object creates an object in the existing OO program, the new configuration data that defines a modified class is used to create the object. In this manner class substitution or redefinition in an OO program is easily accomplished, thereby allowing a new OO program to be easily generated from an existing OO program (or framework).
- **Togawa**, (US Pat. 6,182,156 – 709/316 -1/30/2001), Object-oriented data processing system allowing dynamic change of one or more ancestors and/or descendants of one or more classes of objects, wherein A data processing system at least a portion of which operates under control of an object-oriented program. The data processing system contains an object-oriented system, in which a plurality of objects are defined by the above object-oriented program, each of the plurality of objects belongs to a corresponding one of a plurality of classes as an instance of the

corresponding one of the plurality of classes, and one or more inheritance relationships are defined between at least one pair of classes among the plurality of classes based on inheritance coupling information. An inheritance coupling information setting unit receives a first request, and sets at least one piece of the inheritance coupling information in a data storage area, in response to the first request. The inheritance coupling information held in the inheritance coupling information indicating unit can be referred to by at least one of the above plurality of objects.

- Vic Arnold et al., US-PAT-NO: 5936860 – 8/10/1999 – 700/95, Object oriented technology framework for warehouse control, (see 14:31-40, 15:4-22), wherein the patent teaches that a state is encoded in instance variables (data members in an OOP); banking transactions and related pricing were known to implement this model for the pending claimed relational structures (such use of a relational database management software have been applied for banking transactions, e.g., these para. indicate relationships of an object and access type with the value in the object instance entity); (see the abstract, 13:56 to 14:5); and an **instance variable** or **data member** is data which an object keeps track of (see 16:57-65).
- 42. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CUONG H. NGUYEN whose number is 703-305-4553. The examiner can normally be reached on 7am-3:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's acting supervisor, JEFFREY A. SMITH can be reached on 703-308-3588. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-305-7687/703-746-5572.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Please provide support, with page and line numbers, for any amended or new claim in an effort to help advance prosecution; otherwise any new claim language that is introduced in an amended or new claim may be considered as new matter, especially if the Application is a Jumbo Application.

Cuonghnguyen

CHAN
CUONG H. NGUYEN
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3625